

1 *Original article*

2

3 **Validation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott) to screen for SARS-**
4 **CoV-2 infection in Sint Maarten: a diagnostic accuracy study**

5

6 **Authors:** Colin King¹, Eva Lista-de Weever¹, Maria Henry¹, Radjin Steingrover, PhD²,

7 Chérina Fleming, PhD², Richard Pannefle³, Sanne van Kampen, PhD¹ *

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 1. Collective Prevention Services, Ministry of Health, Social Development and Labor, Sint

11 Maarten

12 2. Department of Microbiology, St Maarten Laboratory Services, Sint Maarten

13 3. Ministerial Office, Ministry of Health, Social Development and Labor, Sint Maarten

14

15 ***Corresponding author:**

16 Dr. Sanne Christine van Kampen

17 Collective Prevention Services

18 Ministry of Health, Social Development and Labor

19 W.G. Buncamper Road 33, Vineyard Building

20 Philipsburg, Sint Maarten

21 Email: Sanne.vankampen@sintmaartengov.org

22 Telephone: +17215249361

23

24 **Word count:** 2,335

25

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 **Abstract**

27 Objectives: Control of the pandemic has required countries to look for other forms of tests
28 besides the gold standard real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). Rapid antigen tests
29 (RAT), though less sensitive than RT-PCR, offer the possibility of rapid, inexpensive and
30 early detection of the most infectious COVID-19 cases. Only very few studies have assessed
31 the performance of the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 RAT among asymptomatic people or in
32 Latin America. This study set out to validate this test among people attending the public test
33 street in Sint Maarten, Dutch Caribbean.

34

35 Methods: People of all ages were recruited from the public COVID-19 test street regardless of
36 COVID-19 symptoms. They received a nasopharyngeal swab for the Abbott Panbio COVID-
37 19 RAT and the RT-PCR Qtower. Diagnostic accuracy of the RAT was compared to the RT-
38 PCR among the overall study population and for subgroups with/without symptoms,
39 with/without close contact and different Ct values.

40

41 Results: Using a RT-PCR Ct cut-off value of <33 , 119 out of 1,411 people (8.4%) tested
42 positive for SARS-CoV-2. Most were asymptomatic (59%). The overall sensitivity and
43 specificity of the RAT was 84% (95% CI 76.2-90.1) and 99.9% (95% CI 99.6-100) respectively.
44 The sensitivity reduced to 67.6% (95% CI: 49.5%, 82.6%) among people without symptoms,
45 regardless of whether they were in close contact with a known COVID-19 case. Sensitivity
46 reduced considerably with a Ct cut-off value of <35 .

47

48 Conclusions: The Abbott Panbio RAT is a valid and cheaper alternative to RT-PCR when
49 used on symptomatic individuals among the general population. However, among

50 asymptomatic people it should not be used as a stand-alone test and negative results should be

51 confirmed with RT-PCR .

52

53 **Introduction**

54 Adequate and rapid diagnostics are essential for the treatment and control of COVID-19.¹

55 The gold standard test to detect the SARS-CoV-2 virus is real-time polymerase chain reaction
56 (RT-PCR), a molecular assay targeting specific viral DNA.² In Sint Maarten, the public health
57 authorities use RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 testing to identify current infections in individuals
58 with signs or symptoms consistent with COVID-19. This testing is also used when an
59 asymptomatic person has been in contact with a SARS-CoV-2 positive case or identified by a
60 positive person through contact tracing.

61

62 While RT-PCR has optimal sensitivity and specificity to detect SARS-CoV-2, it is an
63 expensive technique that can only be performed in well-equipped laboratories with trained
64 laboratory staff. Control of the pandemic has required countries to look for other forms of
65 tests besides the standard RT-PCR. Rapid antigen tests (RAT), though less sensitive than RT-
66 PCR, offer the possibility of rapid, inexpensive and early detection of the most infectious
67 COVID-19 cases in appropriate settings.³ RATs generally use an immunological lateral flow
68 assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 viral antigens.⁴ RATs would be an appropriate alternative to
69 RT-PCR for many settings considering it would reduce the pressure on laboratories, while
70 also expanding testing capacity. A recent study from the Netherlands and Aruba found that
71 the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 RAT had a sensitivity of 87.4% and a specificity of 100%
72 among symptomatic people.⁵ Only very few studies have assessed the performance of the
73 Abbott Panbio COVID-19 RAT among asymptomatic people or in Latin America and the
74 Carribean.^{6 7}

75

76 This study set out to compare the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 RAT to the standard molecular
77 diagnostic assay RT-PCR among people who attended the public COVID-19 test street in Sint
78 Maarten, Dutch Caribbean, regardless of symptoms.

79

80 **Methods**

81

82 *Study population and period*

83 The study population consisted of people from the community of Sint Maarten, of all ages,
84 who voluntarily came to the public test street to receive a COVID-19 test. Participants were
85 enrolled from the 11th of January 2021 until the minimal required sample size was reached.
86 All persons were given verbal information about the testing procedure and were asked for
87 consent to participate in the study. Each person was tested with one nasopharyngeal swab for
88 RT-PCR and another nasopharyngeal swab for RAT by trained public health personnel.
89 People who did not receive two nasopharyngeal swabs, who tested positive for COVID-19 in
90 the past three months or did not consent to participate were not included in the study.

91

92 *Diagnostic tests*

93 RT-PCR test

94 The RT-PCR samples were sent to St Maarten Laboratory Services that operates an in-house
95 open PCR assay using a Q-tower amplification system targeting the SARS-CoV-2 E-gene.
96 Laboratory staff was trained on this system and the system was validated by the National
97 Institute for Public Health and the Environment of the Netherlands (RIVM). Amplification is
98 cut off at 35 cycles.

99

100 Rapid Antigen Test

101 The RAT selected was the Panbio Abbott COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test. This is an
102 immunofluorescence-based lateral flow assay that can detect SARS-CoV-2 antigens within
103 15-30 minutes. This test fits the WHO criteria (sensitivity of $\geq 80\%$, specificity of $\geq 97\%$)⁸ and
104 has been validated in the Netherlands among symptomatic persons.

105

106 *Sample size calculation*

107 Based on Buderer *et al.*,⁹ a minimal required sample size was calculated to accurately
108 estimate the sensitivity and specificity of the RAT with a significance level of 5%. With an
109 estimated sensitivity of 80% and specificity of 97% (WHO's minimum requirements) and a
110 low estimated prevalence of disease of 5%, a minimum sample size of 1,230 participants was
111 estimated to provide a precision of 0.1 for the sensitivity's and specificity's 95% confidence
112 interval.

113

114 *Analysis*

115 Data was collected on demographics, clinical information and test results. Demographics
116 included contact details, age, sex, occupation, and house doctor. Clinical information included
117 COVID-19 symptoms, whether someone had been in close contact with a confirmed COVID-
118 19 patient and the last date of contact. Test results included results from the RT-PCR and
119 RAT tests. Participants with indeterminate or missing results were excluded from the study.
120 The study only collected personal data that was already routinely collected when people
121 attend the public health test street.

122

123 Participant characteristics were compared between people that tested positive and negative for
124 COVID-19 with RT-PCR. Differences in terms of age, sex, symptoms and close contact

125 between both groups were assessed using Pearson Chi-square tests (for proportions) and t-
126 tests (for means) using a significance level of $p=0.05$.

127

128 To evaluate the accuracy of the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 RAT, RT-PCR was used as a
129 reference test to calculate the sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values
130 (PPV, NPV) with their confidence intervals at 95%. In this analysis, RT-PCR results were
131 considered positive if the cycle threshold (Ct) value for amplification of the E-gene was
132 below 33 cycles; and participants missing Ct values were removed. The clinical performance
133 of the RAT was stratified by asymptomatic and symptomatic persons as well as by people
134 with and without close contact to someone with COVID-19. Furthermore, a sensitivity
135 analysis of RAT accuracy was done using various Ct cut-off values for a positive PCR result.
136 All statistical calculations were performed in Stata and SPSS.

137

138 *Ethical approval*

139 Ethical approval was requested from the Sint Maarten Medical Center (SMMC) Medical Ethics
140 Committee, who decided that ethical oversight was not required for this study.

141

142 **Results**

143

144 *Population characteristics*

145 From the 11th of January 2021 to the 26th of February 2021 a total of 1,507 participants were
146 recruited through the public health test street. Thirty participants (2%) had one or two missing
147 test results and were excluded from analysis.

148

149 Of the 1,477 individuals included in the study, the median age was 40.5 years (SD 16), most
150 were female (59%), asymptomatic (59%) and had had no close contact with someone with
151 COVID-19 (60%) (Table 1). Most commonly reported symptoms were headache (17%), cough
152 (17%), runny/stuffy nose (17%), and sore throat (15%).

153

154 A total of 202 (14%) participants tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 with RT-PCR. Among them,
155 the median age was 42.3 years (SD 16.2), most were female (65%) and had had no close contact
156 (62%). An impressive 69% of positive participants reported symptoms. Symptoms significantly
157 associated with testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 were fever, cough, loss of taste or smell, body
158 ache (all $p < 0.00001$) as well as runny/stuffy nose, headache, fatigue and shortness of breath (all
159 $p < 0.05$). Age and having been in close contact with a known COVID-19 case were unrelated.

160

161 *Diagnostic accuracy*

162 For the accuracy analysis, 66 participants were excluded because they had missing RT-PCR Ct
163 values. Of 1,411 people tested, 119 (8%) were positive by RT-PCR and 101 (7%) by RAT;
164 1,292 (92%) were negative by RT-PCR and 1,310 (93%) by RAT (Table 2). This resulted in an
165 overall performance of the RAT with a sensitivity of 84.0%, specificity of 99.9%, PPV of 99.9%
166 and NPV of 98.5% (Table 3). Among people with symptoms, 15% were positive for COVID-
167 19 by RT-PCR and the RAT had an increased sensitivity of 91%. Among people without
168 symptoms, only 4% had COVID-19 and the sensitivity of the RAT decreased to 67.7%. The
169 performance of the RAT did not change when asymptomatic people had had close contact with
170 a known COVID-19 case. All subgroups had a specificity of at least 99.7%; a NPV of at least
171 98%; and PPV of at least 91.7%.

172

173 *Sensitivity analyses*

174 The diagnostic accuracy of the RAT compared to RT-PCR was analysed for Ct values of below
175 35, 30 and 25 (Table 4). Test sensitivity decreased as the Ct cut-off value increased. Especially
176 when a Ct cut-off value of below 35 was used, meaning that samples with very low viral load
177 were still considered positive, the sensitivity of the RAT decreased drastically. Specificity was
178 at least 98.7% for all Ct cut-of values.

179

180 **Discussion**

181 This study found that among the general public of Sint Maarten, the Abbott Panbio COVID-
182 19 RAT identified SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects with an overall sensitivity of 84.0% and
183 specificity of 99.9%. Most participants who attended the national test site were asymptomatic,
184 and half of the asymptomatic people had been in close contact with a COVID-19 positive
185 person. Compared to symptomatic people, the sensitivity was drastically lower among
186 asymptomatic people (67.6%) and below the minimally recommended sensitivity of 80% for a
187 RAT as recommended by WHO and far below the 90% as recommended by ECDC.¹⁰ The
188 NPV among this group remained at 98.7% due to the low prevalence of COVID-19. Although
189 there were slight variations in the specificity for different subgroups, it always stayed above
190 the recommended 97%.

191

192 The 84% overall sensitivity of the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 RAT estimated in this study was
193 very similar to that found in studies using the same Ct cut-off value of <33. For example, two
194 prospective studies in community testing sites in Switzerland and Germany found similar
195 sensitivities of 89.7% and 88.3%, respectively.¹¹ Two studies in Spain that evaluated the
196 Abbott Panbio RAT in primary health care centers reported lower overall sensitivities of
197 71.4% and 79.6% respectively, which may be due to the higher Ct cut-off value used.^{12 13} A
198 real-life validation of the Abbott Panbio RAT in the Netherlands found higher sensitivities of

199 95.2% at the study site in Utrecht and 98% in Aruba. This was a result of testing only
200 symptomatic people and using a lower Ct threshold for positive results. A recent study in the
201 Netherlands focused specifically on asymptomatic football players found an overall
202 sensitivity of 66.7%, which is very similar to the asymptomatic results from our study
203 (67.6%).¹⁴ Despite the differences in sensitivity of the different studies, all had a specificity of
204 over 99%.

205
206 One strength of our study is that it is one of the first COVID-19 diagnostic accuracy studies in
207 the Caribbean, which provides insights into the potential performance of the Abbott Panbio
208 RAT for other Caribbean islands. The findings can also help different islands to decide on
209 how to best incorporate this test into their COVID-19 screening and diagnostic algorithms.
210 Furthermore, this is one of the first studies to specifically include an analysis of asymptomatic
211 participants and showed that it has low accuracy among this group. This may help countries to
212 prioritize this test for symptomatic people – especially those with fever, cough, loss of taste or
213 smell and body ache – and thereby ensure early detection and fast contact tracing of COVID-
214 19 cases.

215
216 One limitation of this study was that it was unable to follow up persons before or after their
217 test result. It is thus unknown whether PCR-positive persons were in the early or late stage of
218 their infection and how the Abbott RAT performed in identifying people in their most
219 contagious period. Further, symptoms were self-reported and may have been over- or
220 underreported, which could have biased the difference in sensitivity between symptomatic
221 and asymptomatic individuals.

222

223 One main implication of this study is that the Abbott RAT is not beneficial as a stand-alone
224 test for asymptomatic people as it will miss approximately one out of three people with
225 COVID-19 in this subgroup. The results show that approximately one out of ten positive
226 individuals with symptoms will not be spotted with the RAT, which makes it an acceptable
227 alternative for this subgroup. These findings confirm that COVID-19 RATs perform better
228 among people with higher viral loads.¹⁵ Based on these findings, the public health authorities
229 in Sint Maarten decided to perform the Abbott Panbio RAT among symptomatic people only,
230 while remaining to test all people attending the test street regardless of symptoms with RT-
231 PCR.

232

233 In conclusion, the Abbott Panbio RAT is a valid and cheaper alternative to RT-PCR for
234 detecting COVID-19 when used on symptomatic individuals among the general population.
235 Taking into consideration the low cost, user-friendliness, and turnaround time, this test would
236 also be beneficial to identify clusters or outbreaks in specific settings when speed of results is
237 of essence. However, among asymptomatic people the Abbott Panbio RAT should not be used
238 as a stand-alone test and negative results should be confirmed with RT-PCR .

239

240 **Conflict of interest**

241 The authors declare to have no conflict of interest.

242

243 **Funding**

244 The Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Tests were donated by the Ministry of Health,
245 Wellbeing and Sports of the Netherlands, for the purpose of this study. No other external
246 funding was received.

247

248 **Acknowledgements**

249 The authors would like to thank the staff and volunteers of the testing team at the Department
250 of Collective Prevention Services of the Ministry of Health, Social Development and Labor of
251 Sint Maarten for conducting data collection and field testing with the Abbott Panbio COVID-
252 19 Rapid Antigen Test.

253

254 **Access to data**

255 The full database is available upon reasonable request from the last author (SvK).

256

257 **Contributions**

258 SvK, EdW, MH and RP conceptualized the study. SvK, RS and CF designed the
259 methodology. RS and CF conducted the laboratory tests. SvK and CK supported field testing
260 and data collection. CK conducted data validation, cleaning and analysis. CK wrote the first

261 draft manuscript. SvK supervised all aspects of the study. All authors reviewed and edited the

262 final manuscript.

263

264

265 **Table 1. Population characteristics of enrolled participants by COVID-19 status**

Variable	Number (%) ¹	COVID-19 RT-PCR + (%)	COVID-19 RT-PCR – (%)	X2 test (p-value) ²
Total	1,477 (100%)	202 (100)	1,275 (100)	-
Age in years (mean, SD)	40.5 (16.3)	42.3 (16.2)	40.2 (16.3)	0.0912
Sex				
Male	608 (41.3)	69 (34.7)	539 (42.3)	0.041064
Female	864 (58.7)	130 (65.3)	734 (57.7)	-
Symptoms				
No symptoms	866 (59.2)	65 (32.3)	801 (63.5)	<0.00001
With symptoms	596 (40.8)	139 (69.2)	460 (36.5)	-
Fever	160 (10.9)	47 (23.4)	113 (9.0)	<0.00001
Cough	242 (16.6)	66 (32.8)	176 (14.0)	<0.00001
Runny / stuffy nose	241 (16.5)	51 (25.4)	190 (15.1)	0.000255
Sore throat	221 (15.1)	38 (18.9)	183 (14.5)	0.106348
Shortness of breath	44 (3.0)	11 (5.5)	33 (2.6)	0.027753
Loss of taste or smell	79 (5.4)	45 (22.4)	34 (2.7)	<0.00001
Headache	251 (17.2)	50 (24.9)	201 (15.9)	0.001808
Body ache	132 (9.0)	44 (21.9)	88 (7.0)	<0.00001
Nausea / vomiting	48 (3.3)	6 (3.0)	42 (3.3)	0.798434
Diarrhea	38 (2.6)	6 (3.0)	32 (2.5)	0.711203
Fatigue / tiredness	99 (6.8)	22 (10.9)	78 (6.2)	0.01304
Other	81 (5.5)	15 (7.5)	66 (5.2)	0.199571
Close contact				
Yes	517 (40.2)	67 (38.1)	450 (40.5)	0.540245
No	770 (59.8)	109 (61.9)	661 (59.5)	-

266 *Legend. RT-PCR: real-time polymerase chain reaction; X2: Chi-square; SD: standard*
 267 *deviation. ¹ Number of missing results by variable: age (7); sex (5); symptoms (15); close*
 268 *contact (190). ² For age, t-test was used.*

269

270 **Table 2. Diagnostics results among all participants (n=1,411) with PCR Ct cut-off of <33**

RAT results (Abbott)	RT-PCR results (Q-tower)		Total
	Positive	Negative	
Positive	100	1	101
Negative	19	1291	1310
Total	119	1292	1411

271 *Legend. RT-PCR: real-time polymerase chain reaction; RAT: rapid antigen test.*

272 **Table 3. Diagnostics results for different subgroups, with PCR positive results with a cycle threshold cut-off of <33**

Participants	n	COVID-19 RT-PCR +	Prevalence (95%CI)	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	PPV (95%CI)	NPV (95%CI)
All participants	1411	119	8.4% (7.0, 10.0)	84.0% (76.2, 90.1)	99.9% (99.6, 100)	99.0% (93.4, 99.9)	98.6% (97.8, 99.0)
With symptoms	550	84	15.3% (12.4, 18.6)	90.5% (82.1, 95.8)	100% (99.2, 100)	100%	98.3% (96.8, 99.1)
Without symptoms	846	34	4.0% (2.8, 5.6)	67.7% (49.5, 82.6)	99.9% (99.3, 100)	95.8% (76.2, 99.4)	98.7% (97.8, 99.2)
With close contact	370	17	4.6% (2.7, 7.3)	64.7% (38.3, 85.8)	99.7% (98.4, 100)	91.7% (60.1, 98.8)	98.3% (96.9, 99.1)
No close contact	374	13	3.5% (1.9, 5.9)	61.5% (31.6, 86.1)	100% (99.0, 100)	100%	98.6% (97.3, 99.3)

273 *Legend. RT-PCR: real-time polymerase chain reaction; CI: confidence interval.*

274

275 **Table 4. Diagnostic accuracy of rapid antigen test compared to RT-PCR with different Ct values as cut-off for positive results**

RT-PCR positives	Number (%)	Prevalence% (95% CI)	Sensitivity% (95% CI)	Specificity% (95% CI)
Ct < 35	136 (100 %)	9.6% (8.1, 11.3)	73.5% (65.3, 80.7)	99.9% (99.6, 100)
Ct < 30	108 (79.4%)	7.7% (6.3, 9.17)	90.7% (83.6, 95.5)	99.8% (99.3, 100)
Ct < 25	86 (62.2%)	6.1% (4.9, 7.47)	97.7% (91.9, 99.7)	98.7% (98, 99.3)

276 *Legend. . RT-PCR: real-time polymerase chain reaction; CI: confidence interval; Ct: cycle threshold.*

277 **References**

278

-
- ¹ Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020 Aug 26;2020(8). <https://www.doi/10.1002/14651858.CD013705/full>
 - ² Vandenberg O, Martiny D, Rochas O, et al. Considerations for diagnostic COVID-19 tests. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2020 Oct 14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-020-00461-z>
 - ³ World Health Organization. Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays. Interim guidance, 11 September 2020. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays>
 - ⁴ Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device | Abbott Point of Care Testing. Available from: <https://www.globalpointofcare.abbott/es/product-details/panbio-COVID-19-ag-antigen-test.html>
 - ⁵ Bonten. COVID-19: hoe betrouwbaar zijn sneltesten? *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk*. 2020;164:C4678. Available at: <https://www.ntvg.nl/artikelen/nieuws/COVID-19-hoe-betrouwbaar-zijn-sneltesten/volledig>
 - ⁶ Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FINN). SARS-CoV-2 Diagnostics: Performance data. Available at: <https://www.finddx.org/COVID-19/dx-data/>
 - ⁷ Rapid antigen tests for the diagnosis of a SARS-CoV-2 infection. University of Heidelberg, Denmark, 2020. Available at: <https://www.klinikum.uni-heidelberg.de/diagnostics-global-health>
 - ⁸ World Health Organization. Advice on the use of point-of-care immunodiagnostic tests for COVID-19: scientific brief. 8 April 2020. Available at:

<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/advice-on-the-use-of-point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-COVID-19-scientific-brief>

⁹ Buderer NM. Statistical methodology: I. Incorporating the prevalence of disease into the sample size calculation for sensitivity and specificity. *Acad Emerg Med*. 1996;3(9):895–900.

¹⁰ European Commission. Current performance of COVID-19 test methods and devices and proposed performance criteria. Working document of Commission services. Created by GROW.R.2.DIR. 17 April 2020. Available at:

<https://ec.europa.eu/docsroom/documents/40805>

¹¹ FIND Evaluation of Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device External Report Version 2.1, 10 December 2020. Available at: [https://www.finddx.org/wp-](https://www.finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Panbio_Ag-Public-Report_v2.1.pdf)

[content/uploads/2020/12/Panbio_Ag-Public-Report_v2.1.pdf](https://www.finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Panbio_Ag-Public-Report_v2.1.pdf)

¹² Bulilete O, Lorente P, Leiva A, Carandell E, Oliver A, Rojo E et al. Evaluation of the Panbio™ rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in primary health care centers and test sites. *medRxiv* 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.13.20231316>

¹³ Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernández-Fuentes MÁ, Martínez M, Poujois S, Forqué L, Valdivia A, Solano de la Asunción C, Ferrer J, Colomina J, Navarro D. Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021 Mar;27(3):472.e7-472.e10. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.11.004.

¹⁴ Winkel, BMF, Schram E, Gremmels H, Debast SB, Schuurman R, Wensing AMJ, Bonten MJM, Goedhart E, Hofstra, LM; Antigen Rapid Test Validation Group. Screening for SARS-CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic individuals using the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott) compared to RT-qPCR. *medRxiv* 2020.

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243311>

¹⁵ Beek JE , Igloi Z, Boelsums T, Fanoy E, Gotz H, Molenkamp R, Van Kampen J, Van Kessel CG, Van der Eijk A, Van de Vijver D, Koopmans M. medRxiv 2020.

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.13.20211524>